JULY – AUGUST 1958

The Reformed Journal

A PERIODICAL OF REFORMED COMMENT AND OPINION

S.F.T.S. LIBRARY

THE HOLLAND CHRISTIAN HIGH SCHOOL STORY
Wilma Por Bouman

EDUCATION IN A PERIOD OF WORLD CRISIS
Richard Tiemersma

THE WITNESS OF OUR WORSHIP SERVICE
Hugh A. Koops

BOOK REVIEWS

Recent Releases

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN ROMAN CATHOLIC THOUGHT —

G. C. Berkouwer

A penetrating study written expressly to assess the powerful new currents in Catholic theology. A must for understanding the changing face of Roman Catholic theology today. *A Pathway Book*, **$1.50.**

THE RIDDLE OF LIFE

J. H. Bavinck

This absorbing book seeks to penetrate those inscrutable mysteries suspended as a curtain between God and man which give rise to the ever recurring questions that plague the mind of man. **$2.00**

JONATHAN EDWARDS ON EVANGELISM

Edited by J. C. Wolf

Wolf's bicentennial anthology-digest of America's greatest Calvinist reveals a mind that is ever fresh and penetrating, from which the Church today can learn much concerning her evangelical witness to the world. **$2.00**

JONATHAN EDWARDS' SERMON OUTLINES

Edited by Sheldon B. Quincer

Of special value to the evangelistically minded minister are these 35 meaty outlines of Edwards' most outstanding sermons. **$2.50**

at your bookstore

Wm. B. EERDMANS PUBLISHING CO.
GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN

The Reformed Journal

A PERIODICAL OF REFORMED COMMENT & OPINION

Volume VIII No. 7

JULY - AUGUST 1958

Editorial Board

HENRY STOB, HARRY R. BOER, JAMES DAANE
LESTER DEKOSTER, GEORGE STOB

Publisher

William B. Eerdmans, Sr.

THE HOLLAND CHRISTIAN HIGH SCHOOL STORY 3
Wilma Por Bouman, *Member of Holland Christian School Society, Holland, Michigan*

EDUCATION IN A PERIOD OF WORLD CRISIS 10
Richard Tiemersma, *Assistant Professor of English, Calvin College*

THE WITNESS OF OUR WORSHIP SERVICE 16
Rev. Hugh Koops, *Home Missionary, Christian Reformed Church, Champaign-Urbana, Illinois area*

BOOK REVIEWS 18

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, excepting August, by the Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, at 231 Jefferson Avenue, S.E.,, Grand Rapids 3, Michigan. Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Grand Rapids, Michigan.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: 25c per copy; $2.50 one year; $4.00 two years.

ADDRESS all subscriptions to Subscription Department, *The Reformed Journal*, 231 Jefferson Avenue, S. E., Grand Rapids 3, Michigan. Address all editorial and advertising communications to Managing Editor and Advertising Manager respectively.

Managing Editor: Calvin P. Bulthuis; Advertising Manager: David Wynbeek.

THE HOLLAND CHRISTIAN HIGH SCHOOL STORY*

by Wilma Por Bouman

THE HOLLAND CHRISTIAN HIGH SCHOOL STORY is significant because it is a story of people seeking to establish a right. It is a story, moreover, which helps to focus attention on some questionable interpretations and practices of the Bureau of School Services[1] at the University of Michigan and on those of the North Central Association,[2] particularly its Michigan State Committee.

In 1954 Holland Christian High School of Holland, Michigan, a school continuously accredited since 1924 by the Bureau of School Services and since 1925 by the North Central Association, and recognized as one of the better academic schools in the state, began to have its educational standards challlenged. During that year the North Central Association, through its Michigan Committee, informed the school that it regarded a well-balanced curriculum imperative and "indicated that because of the violation of criterion 2A and B [no physical education, industrial arts, or homemaking] the Association had decided that the school should be *Advised*" (*Annual Report of Superintendent,* 1956). It must be noted here that nowhere in the North Central criterion 2A and B are these subjects specifically mentioned. Only in the two-year plan of the Bureau are these subjects specifically required.

In a subsequent letter from the Board to the Society it was emphasized "that, in order to retain our accreditation, it is first of all necessary that we satisfy the requirements of the Bureau of School Services of the University of Michigan, and that these requirements definitely demand that certain subjects be given within the area of Industrial Arts and Homemaking. . . . Only by complying with these requirements can we remain accredited both with the University of Michigan and the NCA." The first *Warning,* NCA's second step in withdrawing accreditation, came in March of 1955.

Feeling that this questioning of its school's educational theory ought to be discussed publicly, the PTA of Holland Christian sponsored a panel discussion on the relative merits of including shop and home economics in the curriculum so that accreditation might be retained. Dr. Clarence De Graaf of Hope College, Holland, Michigan, stressed that it was not wise educationally to include these subjects and that the matter of accreditation itself should be of secondary consideration; panel members Leon Waskin, of the Michigan State Committee of the North Central and of the State Department of Education, and Dr. Henry Ryskamp, Dean of Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Michigan, believed accreditation was of such worth that it warranted putting in shop and home economics. It was brought out that Calvin's own accreditation would be in jeopardy if eventually too many students were accepted from non-accredited schools. A second *Warning* from the Michigan Committee of the NCA came in April of 1956.

The School Society then asked for a discussion meeting to inquire further into the ramifications of this subject. At the meeting of June 28, 1956, those who believed that the school should include these two subjects maintained that from "an educational point of view, it is desirable that our high school teach industrial arts and home economics." Their reasons were based on the present concept of the American secondary school that "it is no longer selective and exclusive; . . . [and that] compulsory school laws have given added impetus":

1. Children differ greatly in their aptitude and abilities in the various areas of learning. Schools must con-

---

** I wish to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Clarence De Graaf, Head of the English Department, Hope College, whose gracious help and discerning criticism have done much to make this report possible.*

1. All high schools in Michigan that wish to be accredited must first be accredited by the state accrediting agency, which is the Bureau of School Services at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. The criteria of the Two-Year Plan are standardized by the University and encourage the community school to develop its philosophy and objectives from an analysis of such factors as Understanding the Community, Using Community Resources, and Serving the Community. For its Four-Year Plan, the Bureau adopts the policies, regulations, and criteria of the North Central Association.

2. The North Central Association is a regional accrediting agency and covers nineteen mid-western states. Its criteria are broader and less specific than the two-year criteria of the Bureau. In Michigan and California, the NCA has its basic accreditation done by the university of the state; in other states it is done by the Department of Public Education. A school cannot be a member of the North Central Association without first being accredited in the highest classification of its state, which in Michigan is the Bureau's Four-Year Plan.

sider these varying needs, abilities, problems, and interests. The school program must be made flexible and adjusted or adapted to the needs of the individual pupil. (This is not a denial that there remains a large area of common needs and common learnings.)

2. School should give every individual opportunity to develop and grow along lines most suited to his individual interests, needs and abilities. It should provide experience for growth and development of the creative ability of the individual along the lines of music, drama, fine arts, manual arts, hobbies, etc.
3. Successful participation in the school program is essential to good mental health.

(*Special Report to Society*, June 28, 1956)

Dr. De Graaf upheld the position that neither from a Christian educational point of view nor from any other educational point of view was it desirable to include these subjects. From the Christian point of view, he said, the emphasis in education must be placed on those factors that reflect the image of God. "These," said he, "are not manual skills; they are judgment, understanding, insight, moral responsibility to God, distinction between good and evil, the recognition of evil in a secular society. . . . Of the training in critical thinking we already have too little rather than too much."

The opinion held by some of our leaders who had studied this matter, Dr. Henry Stob, Dr. John Van Bruggen, Dr. Lambert Flokstra, and the late Dr. Henry Zylstra, was that "instruction in manual arts and home economics is extraneous [unrelated] to the purpose of Christian education. This does not mean that these may not have practical value, but they are not essential to the responsibility of providing a distinctive Christian education" (*Report to Society,* June, 1956).

From a purely educational point of view these subjects are not desirable, Prof. De Graaf said, for these reasons:

1. It is a further move in the direction of special interests. When we begin to serve the particular needs of particular groups, we have no right to serve some and neglect others. Why not also train salesmen, hairdressers, farmers, and machine shop workers?
2. Even though such a course is offered as a restricted elective, it must take the place of other electives or of required subjects.
3. Those courses in many schools are regarded as "snap" courses for easy credit. Students are not helped by giving them easy credit instead of hard work.
4. Many students who spend time in these non-credit courses have great regrets, if later they still wish to go to college.
5. The broader courses in economics, history, and social science can teach the right attitudes toward industry and homemaking without giving time and training to the specific skills.
6. In comparison with the highly technical skills required in modern industry, the courses taught in the high schools are merely play courses.
7. Industry is able and willing to give on-the-job train ing in far more realistic manner.
8. Boys and girls need more training in the understand ing of social problems in preparation for partici pation in later life.
9. We are doing less and less for the superior studen and more and more for the less gifted student — particularly is this true in mathematics.
10. The program of "learning by doing" is now re ceiving widespread criticism throughout the lan for having watered down American education.
11. In Europe vocational schools exist alongside th liberal arts schools but not in combination wit them.

At the meeting of June 1956 it was also reporte that the High School faculty had voted against the introduction of these courses and had presente arguments for its position on the basis that such courses would not help to strengthen the cause o Christian education. Others at the meeting men tioned that industry does not prefer manual-arts trained graduates but rather those trained in the basic disciplines; that although inviting this pos sible loss of accreditation would be a blow to a goo school, yet this consideration was indeed not the prime concern; and that the right to determine which non-basic subjects a school desired to offer should belong to the community, not to accrediting agencies.

IN JULY OF 1956 the education committee of the Board met with accreditation officials (the Chairman of the Michigan Committee of the NCA the Director of the Bureau of School Services, an the Chairman of the Executive Committee of th Bureau of School Services) to see if any leniency could be expected from the NCA. The officials wer adamant in their position: no curricular offering in shop and homemaking — no accreditation. Dr Lester Anderson, at present Chairman of the Mich igan Committee of the NCA for Secondary School and Colleges and a member of the Bureau of Schoo Services, had reported to the NCA Commissio in April that the state of Michigan would no recommend any school for accreditation with th NCA that failed to comply with the demand for diversified program providing every youngste with an opportunity to participate in the seve areas established by NCA's Michigan Committee The Committee would consider no school exemp from the sevenfold responsibility to the commu nity, regardless whether the community wante these marginal courses or not. Private schools, a well as public schools, must meet these require ments to remain accredited. This position, take in the face of a broader NCA criterion that states "Each school should be free to determine its philos ophy to the extent that it promotes the principle and spirit of American democracy," creates a

ndesirable impasse because conflicting educational heories do exist.[3]

Convinced of the autonomy vested by the NCA n its State Committee, the Board submitted this roposal to the Holland Christian School Society t the annual meeting, September 24, 1956:

> Your Board, realizing the importance of continued official accreditation, believing the introduction of a broadened educational program to be beneficial to our youth and in harmony with basic principles of Christian education, recommends to the School Society the adoption of plans to include Industrial Arts and Homemaking in the curriculum as elective subjects.

It was immediately established at this meeting hat no parent had ever requested the introduction f home economics and industrial arts. Although he present curriculum includes a commercial ourse, choir, and band, these had not been admitted to satisfy accreditation requirements. The Board invited discussion on the cost of the proosed additions but little interest was shown, and o figures were requested. One member remarked, A program, regardless of the cost, does not beong in our schools unless it can be justified in erms of sound educational theory." The Society ejected the proposal of the Board by a vote of 372 o 249.

On January 8, 1957, the Michigan Committee of he NCA wired the school that it would recommend dropping Holland Christian; in February the Society was apprised of this wire. Twelve members of the Society then requested that a special meeting be called to discuss the present status of accreditation and by majority vote to take the action required to maintain accreditation. On March 24, 1957, the Society reemphasized its position by voting 350 to 221 to refuse to put shop and home economics in its curriculum if it was to do this only to save accreditation. The Society asked he Board to appeal its cause.

Holland Christian presented its appeal at the annual meeting of the NCA in Chicago in April, 1957. The Michigan Committee's recommendation had been made to the NCA Reviewing Committee, which in turn had passed it on to the NCA Executive Committee. The appeal pointed out, among other arguments, that shop and home economics are not required subjects in NCA-accredited schools in some states.

3. Dr. De Graaf maintains that such a position makes the state of Michigan a victim of policies adopted by a single committee on the University campus, and that the extent of this unwholesome pressure is evident from the report of the annual meeting of the NCA as reported in its quarterly magazine (July, 1957). In the neighboring state of Illinois, 460 high schools out of 532 were unqualifiedly recommended for accreditation. In Michigan, only 126 schools out of 270, or 46 percent were given unqualified recommendation for accreditation. In Indiana, 112 out of 188 were given the best rating.

On April 8, 1958, Holland Christian learned of the portentous decision. Deprived of NCA accreditation, it had a last opportunity to appeal the NCA action at the meeting of the NCA Executive Committee on June 18. It did so, with a closely reasoned argument based on the principles involved. But the NCA curtly replied that procedurally all matters had been properly handled and that there was no basis for appeal.

THE ACTION was drastic and, to many, ridiculous. National publicity followed upon it. *The National Review, The Saturday Evening Post, Life,* and *Time* picked up the story and suggested that the NCA action was nonsense of the first order! Several newspapers, too, declared themselves in favor of the Holland Christian position. A ground swell of support for the position taken by the school began to roll in.

First to appear was an article by Russell Kirk, "Who Accredits Accreditors?" in *The National Review,* March 22, 1958: "It is not pure chance that the rigor of these educationists has been exercised against church-connected schools. There ought to be a monopoly of education by the state, the disciples of John Dewey tell us: one uniform system, 'educating for democracy'—totalist democracy.... Why does the University of Michigan accredit a crew of anti-intellectual doctrinaires as its official accreditors? And why do the colleges and high schools of the North Central Association endure the arrogant sloganizing of a tight little knot of doctors of education?"

Said the *Post*: "Don't put hobbles on schools that really educate!" *Life* maintained that "the problem underlying all our confusion is . . . a matter of tradition and philosophy"; while *Time* observed: "Thirty years of 'life adjustment' by the followers of Progressive Educator John Dewey have left U.S. education overadjusted, ill-equipped to quicken intellectual life." The Ann Arbor *News* commented: "Holland Christian's view would be a minority one, but aren't they entitled to it?" In "A High School That Flunked," The Chicago *Tribune* vehemently remarked: "This case study clearly shows that the North Central Association has resolved to approve no school that offers to every one's child an academic course of study, however excellent and well taught. . . . "

The Detroit *Free Press* ventured that here was a "golden opportunity" for heckled and misunderstood educationists to prove that their main interest was really sound education by restoring accreditation to Holland Christian.

The Council for Basic Education, under the heading "While Rome Burns," (*CBE Bulletin,* April, 1958) agreed with *Life,* the *Post,* and *National Review* "that this is an unhealthy situation. There is something ironic in the thought that

schools which are honestly trying to meet the present desperate need for well-educated persons should be censured for it."

On the Senate floor at Lansing, Michigan, Senator Clyde Geerlings protested: "It is grossly unfair to penalize the student who is well prepared for college . . . because some of the students who do not plan on college have not received vocational training . . . . These are entirely unrelated programs, and the Association is using one as a lever to get another."

AFTER THIS notable expression of public concern, the Bureau of School Services still had to decide whether to keep Holland Christian on its four-year plan, reduce it to its two-year plan, or follow the NCA and withdraw accreditation. Meanwhile, the faculty of the college of literature, science, and arts at the University of Michigan voted to admit without examination graduates from any school dropped from accreditation for reasons other than academic, provided students were otherwise properly qualified.

On February 26, 1958, an educational corps, consisting of a few observers and seventeen educators (including experts in shop and homemaking), was sent by the Bureau to evaluate each department in the school. Although separate reports of the findings of this visit were sent to the heads of the respective departments in the school, the following information is part of a public release by the Board:

> After our high school had been examined by members of the staff of the University and a member of the Department of Public Instruction, the Bureau contacted the Board unofficially to find out whether we would make any statement as to a willingness to work in the direction of removing alleged deficiencies in our course offerings. On April 8th, the Board authorized the following resolution to be sent to the Bureau:
> The Board of Trustees of Holland Christian Schools desires to retain the accreditation of our senior high school by the Bureau of School Services of the University of Michigan and will work with it to do everything possible to improve our facilities and curricular offerings. However, attention is called to the decision of the School Society not to include Industrial Arts and Homemaking in the curriculum.

On May 6th the Bureau sent the following letter with regard to our accreditation:

> Mr. Raymond Holwerda, Principal
> Holland Christian High School
>
> Dear Mr. Holwerda:
>
> We wish to inform you that the Hollland Christian High School has been placed on the list of secondary schools accredited by the University of Michigan for a two-year period beginning July 1, 1958 and ending June 30, 1960.
>
> The Executive Committee was influenced by the letter sent by the Board of Trustees signifying an interest in working with the University of Michigan in removing some of the deficiencies cited in the accreditation letter of April 9, 1958.
>
> Very truly yours,
> (Signed) Kent W. Leach
>
> KWL:db
> CC: Dr. Bert Bos, Supt.

It is interesting to note that the Bureau unoffi cially asked the school board if it would be willin to work toward removing some of the deficiencie found by the Bureau. Although many complimen tary remarks were included in the report, I sha cite only the following from two of the visitors:

> The purposefulness with which both faculty an students attack their studies is worthy of the highe praise. I was impressed, too, with the excellence of th instruction.
>
> I was usually favorably impressed with the high lev of the staff morale, the unusually great attentivenes participation, and respectfulness of the students. believe that they are deriving more than an averag benefit from their education experience at the high scho level. I consider that the daily chapel experience is bonus of real virtue in addition.

But what about the deficiencies found by the Bureau The Board's release states:

> There were also suggestions and recommendation These are under study by the faculty members cor cerned, the administrative officers, members of th Educational Committee, and by the Board member Suggestions for more or less major changes or add tions were made by the examiners in the followin areas: library, guidance and testing, business educatio facilities, physical education, foreign languages, in dustrial arts and homemaking.

Words like "more or less," of course, tell us littl For instance, one evaluator, from a departmen other than Library, included this in his report:

> Finally, I was much impressed by the library. It wa obviously the center of the school. It was intellectuall respectable. While it does not possess a large collectio its books are carefully chosen. It is clear that th library has received a good deal of recent attentio The classics are well represented and are available i attractive editions. The reference collection is adequa but not outstanding. The periodicals are creditab and mature. Above all, the books are used and th library is an integral part of the school's life."

The school offers two foreign languages: Germa and Latin. It does not offer industrial arts an home making, but 4-H activities and social club offer some training in these areas.

In making its decision the Bureau could avai itself of the words of L. G. Derthick, U.S. Commis sioner of Education, who has stated that althoug the Bureau's "standards are similar to those of th North Central Association they are not identical i that schools may receive State accrediting that d not meet certain of the requirements of the Nort Central Association." This thought is furthe brought out by the Bureau's Criteria for Accredi tation: "It is the policy of the Bureau, however that membership in the North Central Associatio is not a necessary condition for four-year accred itation by the University of Michigan." The Bu reau could also avail itself of opinions expressed i national magazines and newspapers. The Detroi *Free Press* had commented: "The opportunity w spoke of as available to the University of Michiga whose Bureau of School Services administrate NCA standards in Michigan, can be seized with eas

the Bureau promptly meets and restores Chris-an High's accreditation and recommends to the CA that it do likewise. Such a forthright move ould demonstrate to the public that educators are sponsive to public will and that high standards e what professional education organizations seek uphold rather than to dissipate."

But on May 8, 1958, the Bureau publicly an-ounced through a press release from Ann Arbor at it had reduced Holland Christian from its ur-year accreditation status to a two-year status. s reported in the Holland *Evening Sentinel* (May 1958),

> Vice President James A. Lewis, Executive Committee Chairman, noted these points concerning the decision on Holland Christian High School:
>
> . . . Accreditation is designed primarily "as a process to evaluate a school's program" as a service to the school and its community and is of secondary importance in college admission.
>
> Mr. Lewis also stated that some general differences in criteria for two and four year accreditation by the University are as follows:
>
> 1. Four-year schools must have more extensive guidance and testing programs.
> 2. Their library services and selection of books are broader.
> 3. Their teachers' professional qualifications are higher.
> 4. Their breadth of educational program is wider.
> 5. Their counseling time per student is higher.
> 6. Their laboratory facilities for scientific instruction are more extensive.

The Bureau, be it noted, has here gone to some ngth to point out the differences in the two-year nd the four-year plans. One would expect that all ne differences mentioned would specifically per-ain to the school, but they did not. The Bureau alls attention to teacher requirements, although Iolland Christian's faculty qualifications far xceed those required by even the NCA, and the aboratory facilities, an area not listed among the eficiencies. This seems to have confused the ssue. Moreover, the Bureau's two-year plan, to vhich the school had been reduced, is precisely the ne that requires shop and home economics!

What, it may be asked, was the point of reduc-ng the school from four-year to two-year classi-ication when the school filled the Bureau's four-ear requirements better than its two-year require-nents? Perhaps the answer is found in the purpose of the ingenious instrument called classification. The U. S Department of Education clarifies the meaning of classification by quoting the opinions of various schoolmen as to its purpose ("State Accredi-tation of High Schools," *Bulletin* 1955, No. 5, p. 19). A Michigan schoolman is quoted as saying:

> "I am certain that the small schools in Michigan are using accrediting as a lever to get improved conditions from communities and boards of education. In general, lowering the classification is helpful to principals and superintendents in meeting higher standards."

And an educator from Arizona reports:

> Our difference in classification forms a type of leader situation wherein a school moves from class B through class A and into North Central Accreditation . . . . Disapproving or lowering the classification of a school in many instances lends the necessary impetus to a community or school district to see that the school does not remain in the lower classification. In some instances it has caused a little discomfort to the principal or superintendent; in more cases it has given him the necessary leverage to accomplish what the community may have hesitated to accomplish."

I wish here to state that I believe accreditation and classification of accreditation are, when properly used, salutary. But when educators speak of "raising the standards" or "making the standards flexible," they likely run at cross purposes, for standards are determined by educational ideals. Conflicting theories sometimes produce conflicting objectives, and when one group interferes with the theory and practice of another, accreditation and classification may be abused. For instance, will reducing the Holland Christian School to a two-year classification be used as a lever to introduce the kind of subject matter into the school's curriculum that the Society feels may interfere with a more excellent accomplishment of its own theory of education, or will a compromise be worked out that will permit the school to strengthen certain areas according to its particular philosophy? The Bureau's report mentioned the sensitive areas of industrial arts and homemaking and suggested that "since lasting educational changes cannot be effected through administrative fiat, the most that anyone can hope is that the administration continues to show active interest in keeping these and other issues alive." This should be a matter of thoughtful concern.

The public is responsible for the foundations on which its public education is laid, and it must give active demonstration of this responsibility when the foundations are attacked by those to whom it has entrusted authority over education. But if the public is to meet its responsibility intelligently, the authorities ought publicly to explain and justify their criticism and action. The Bureau's press release on Holland Christian's accreditation confused rather than enlightened a seriously concerned public, and the decision of the Bureau left everyone wondering, What next?

BEHIND THE Holland Christian High School story lies a decision that has had far-reaching effects. In 1954 the Bureau of School Services sent questionnaires to 500 Michigan schoolmen in an effort to determine the real attitudes of Michigan educators. Evaluations of this survey were made by groups of teachers, principals, and superintendents. Thereupon the University of Michigan decided to adopt the Bureau's newly revised criteria

for accreditation which were geared to the results of this survey and to the advice offered from the field. Prior to this, NCA-accredited schools in Michigan had little difficulty maintaining or meeting accreditation requirements, but the year following this drastic revision, the *North Central Association Quarterly* reported that 143 out of 270 Michigan NCA-accredited schools were *Advised* and *Warned.*

Furthermore, the NCA has stated that although one of its original purposes was to insure college admission advantages for graduates from NCA-accredited schools, this purpose has changed with the development of accreditation by state departments of education and by state universities (*Know Your North Central,* January 1955, p. 21).

The abnormally high percentage of *Advised* and *Warned* NCA-accredited schools, together with the change in original purpose of the NCA, ought to challenge every college and university to clarify the purpose of accreditation and to inquire whether departments of education and accrediting agencies are proper agents for laying the "benchmarks" for admission to liberal arts colleges.

From both verbal and written public proclamation, it becomes increasingly evident that the public's idea of what constitutes sound education is at variance with the theory of the group that defines and controls the pattern for all our schools. Says the Council for Basic Education in a letter entitled "The Main Job of Our Schools" (1966), "Public education under democracy is no more exclusively the domain of a little group of technical specialists than is justice and good government. Our schools are naturally and properly a matter of public concern."

Through centralization and consolidation this group has nearly complete control of education. Members of the Bureau of School Services are often members of the NCA State Committee (the present Chairman of the Michigan State Committee of the NCA is also Assistant Director of the Bureau), and Bureau standards are the gauge by which NCA criteria are defined. The index finger of the educationist cult is kept on the necessary controls by vesting each administrator with nearly complete control; curriculum revision is in his hands; he is chief executive officer of the board; he alone may recommend employing, promoting, demoting, and discharging of staff members and other employees; board members do not function as board members except in official session unless authorized to do so; the administrator must attend all board meetings except when his own employment is under consideration; no staff member or other employee has access to the board except through him; any interference with the administration of the high school by individuals or organized groups will call for an official visit if such interference is "likely to result in a lowering of th effectiveness of the educational program."

Although the educationalists in control profess t want academic preparedness too, one is forced t ask whether they really do. One of the NCA eva uators, after appraising the shop and homemakin departments at the Mecosta, Michigan, high schoo had to be reminded by a board member that th school's academic offerings ought also to be ap praised. A hypothetical case proposed by the boar member drew a startling answer from the NC representative: were he faced with having to ac credit either a high school that had only the basi academic subjects and none of the fringe subject or one that had none of the basic disciplines an only the frills, his choice by NCA standards woul have to be the latter school. Recently the Burea of School Services criticized the University of De troit High School, an excellent preparatory schoo which sends over 90 percent of its graduates o to college, for having a program "devoted wholl to preparation of young people for college," an it warned the High School that it must put a sto to that one-sidedness or a test case would be mad of this school, too.

These experts also want "democratic" freedom for high-school students to elect their own subjects They frown on authoritarianism, yet their own peculiar insistence that mature board members parents, and educators be forced to put non-basic in the curriculum manifests the very authoritarian ism they so bitterly decry. This same narrow at titude was exposed by the Detroit *Free Press* i commenting on the Holland Christian High Schoo case: "The NCA, by lifting Christian High's ac creditation, has arbitrarily slapped a second-rat label on a first-rate school. This is extremely un fair and indicates the strange logic too often fol lowed by narrow-minded educators. Educator frequently plead that parental pressure is respon sible for the frill courses that have swampe school curricula. In this instance, a professiona education organization has flown directly into th face of this claim. A parent society that operate Christian High has voted not to teach the disputed courses."

The Bureau and NCA officials told Holland Christian representatives: "A school's course o study should include opportunity for pupils' par ticipation in shop, homemaking, art, crafts, music journalism, etc. Fundamentals in these fields are needed even if a student is college-destined. We should offer a democratic education — not only one for the elite! Arts and crafts are not vocational — they are only basic fundamentals." But only by offering the NCA brand of education is one eligible to wear the badge of the elite — NCA accredited itation!

To equate or level all these subjects and craft

nd to declare all of them as fundamental to edu-ation is to dissipate them. "When the schoolman f today implies that education is only for an in-ellectual elite and attempts to water it down, or ractically eliminate it, on the assumption that ost people aren't up to it — when he does this, e is dooming the vast majority to intellectual and ultural subservience" (Mortimer Smith, *The iminished Mind,* p. 8) Furthermore, if unchecked entralization and consolidation of power are nemies of true democracy, why do we permit our chools to harbor this danger? We provide checks nd balances in our own federal government to revent this evil.[4]

Living in a democracy, we are the guardians of he justice and liberty for which it stands. Ed-aund Burke once observed that "the rights of men re in a sort of middle, incapable of definition, but ot impossible to be discerned"; Russell Kirk (in *he Conservative Mind*) shows that justice and iberty stand or fall together, and that natural ight cannot be identical with popular power; for, f it fails to accord with justice, it ceases to be a ight.

IN THE LIGHT of these facts and on the basis of the following NCA and Bureau principles and riteria, it would seem only reasonable that Holland Christian be accredited by both these "popular owers":

1. Guiding Principle II: It should be accepted as a principle of procedure that deficiency in one field may be compensated for by strength in other fields — no school should be denied accreditation because it fails to meet a specific standard, if its total pattern of achievement is good.

2. Guiding Principle III: A school should be judged, in so far as possible, in terms of its own philosophy and the purpose which it serves in its own community. The fact should be recognized that individual differences exist among schools and among communities.

3. Guiding Principle VI: While it seems desirable that criteria regard as basic certain characteristics, such as faculty preparation, the intellectual and moral tone of a school, the nature of the school plant, the adequacy of equipment and supplies, the quality of the school library and library service, the condition of the records, the policies of the board of education, the financial status, the teaching load, and the educational program, it should be recognized that considerable divergence from normal standards may occur in one of these characteristics without greatly detracting from the educational merits of an institution. Uniformity in every detail stifles educational experimentation and is not only unnecessary but undesirable.

4. Criterion I B: Philosophy of the School: Each school should be free to determine its philosophy to the extent that it promotes the principles and spirit of American democracy.

The confines of the Bureau's narrow criteria, however, render these broader principles incapable of dealing decisively and fairly with all schools.

It would also seem reasonable that thirty-two years of continued accreditation and an enviable academic reputation would be regarded as an asset by an accrediting agency and that, although the North Central confers prestige on the schools it accredits, its own prestige would be enhanced by the quality and type of school it numbers among its members.

That a closely banded group of authorities can discredit schools whose educational "philosophies" are at variance with theirs is a fact that should greatly disturb the public. There are many who hold that "schools are primarily the training grounds for the intellectual virtues" and who agree with the Council for Basic Education that "all students, excepting only those few whose intellectual equipment is clearly too limited, receive adequate instruction in the basic intellectual disciplines, especially English, mathematics, science, history, and foreign languages. . ." (*CBE Statement of Purpose*).

It is extremely important that all our public schools be free to operate in a more flexible pattern than the present system permits or American democracy may turn into total, uniform, unchecked "democracy." It is important, too, that all private and preparatory schools be free to maintain their rights (without denying them accreditation), or such schools will be forced out of existence. Finally, it is equally important that Christian, Catholic, and other church-connected schools be free to implement their own theories of education, or Bible and theology will be replaced by subjects such as woodworking and rug-weaving.

The NCA's Michigan Committee has boldly asserted: "Accreditation is Society's judgment that your school is doing a good job." But failure to accredit a school which is demonstrably doing a good job by standards long established in Western society and in Christian communities may mean that it is time for judgment to begin in the house of the accreditors.

---

4. To give the reader an example of the danger in the centralization of policies and procedures of our public school system, with the New Educationists charting the course, Augustine Rudd (*Bending the Twig,* p. 266) shows how the National Education Association operates by co-ordinating its activities and contacts with lay groups — among them, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers (PTA), National School Boards Association, and the National Citizens Committee for the Public Schools. Says Author Rudd: "In allying itself with such community-centered organizations as the eight-million-member Parent Teachers Association, it will be seen that the NEA could muster strong local support for its announced war on opponents of its programs. At the same time, the PTA itself has been carefully shorn of the power to make trouble for the New Educationists. The by-laws of the National Parent Teachers Association declare that 'local units . . . shall not seek to direct the administrative activities of the schools or to control their policies. The tiny, and easily controlled, group in charge of National and State PTA Congresses has practical power to manipulate the entire organization .... When some local PTA bodies in California and Indiana attempted to act in defiance of this policy, they were quickly reminded of the by-laws and their protests were ruled out of order."

Education in a Period of World Crisis

by Richard Tiemersma

THE RECENT CONCERN over Russia's apparent scientific lead over the United States has caused the American citizen to take a hard and long-overdue look at the American educational system. This is a good thing, and as a proponent of liberal education I am more than pleased with the fact that the public has been awakened. It is a pity that this interest must again be motivated by fear; I should have preferred to see public interest based on principle. But the result is perhaps the same in either case: what had been the concern of only the professional educator and a small minority of interested and intelligent laymen has suddenly become a matter of grave importance to the man in the street. For this we may thank the Russian Sputnik.

The question is: What kind of education is best adapted to serve us in this period of world crisis? And my answer is: The kind of education which the traditionalist has all along been insisting on as the best kind of education at any time, a liberal education. For liberal education educates for life. And what is life but a continuous series of crises? To be sure, one crisis may present itself in more dramatic form than another. And the current crisis is dramatic indeed. But it differs essentially from other crises only in the fact that it threatens to achieve on a superlative basis and in a few moments that which has always been a threat to mankind: the destruction of life, of civilization, and of cultural values. It is against these that liberal education has always offered itself as a champion, and it does so now.

I take my cue from a recent speech of President Eisenhower's in which he says:

> I wish that every school board and every P.T.A. would this week and this year make one special project their special order of business. This is to scrutinize your school's curriculum and standards; then decide for yourselves whether they meet the stern demands of the era we are entering.

I take my cue from him, not because he is the President, for Presidents have often been wrong, not even because he is a Republican President, although this materially reduces the chances of his being wrong; not because of the excellence of the style or grammatical structure of the plea, for in this respect it differs little from his other pronouncements except that here he happens to complete his sentences. But I take my cue from him because the President has put his finger on the real failure of much of the so-called education of o age — a failure to teach the right materials and failure to set the proper standards of achievemer

Curriculum and standards, then, and first t curriculum.

OF RECENT YEARS there has been an increasi misconception of the school's function. T traditionalist has always maintained that t school's primary task has been the development man's humanity in terms of his basic relationshi to God, his universe, his fellowman, his state, ar himself. Or, to put it in other terms, the traditio alist has held that the school is specifically charge with the development, informing, and disciplir of the intellect. I shall not enlarge on this poin I merely restate it and refer you for a defense that view to the writings and speeches of suc men as Newman, Hutchins, Livingstone, and thos of our own men who have concerned themselve with this matter.

But in recent years the idea has gained grea currency that the function of the school is th "development of the whole man." It is an appea ing notion, this development of the whole man, an one to which the traditionalist is, at first sigh moved to respond "Amen!" The notion become particularly, even glitteringly, appealing when takes the form so often heard among us — "th development of the whole student in Christ."

But as a traditionalist I have two serious ob jections to it. The first is that all too often thi is interpreted as meaning "Let us cut out thi nonsense about intellectual development and ge down to the important things such as the salvatio of the soul and earning a living" — both of whic really are important, the first being in very trut "the one thing needful" and the second being th absolute prerequisite to even a bare animal exist ence. My real objection is to the first part of tha interpretation, "Let us cut out this nonsense abou intellectual development." And that, in turn, lead directly to my second objection to the concept tha the school must labor "to develop the whole man," whether he be in Christ or not. For the develop ment of the *whole* man in this sense is the task not of the school alone, but of the whole of society each institution cooperating with all the others and no single institution either pre-empting the function of another or shirking its duty in the cooperative enterprise.

The school, then, assumes the responsibility for ne informing and disciplining of the mind. And the school's *education* contributes to the develop- nent of those aspects which lie outside of the trictly intellectual — whether in the realm of eligion or the work-a-day world — well and good. et us accept this contribution as a kind of "fringe enefit." And just as fringe benefits constitute no mall part of labor's rewards today, so, too, these fringe benefits" of a liberal education as I have efined it are by no means to be despised. But hey are still "fringe benefits" and, as such, are not o be substituted for the real contribution which he school, alone among the many institutions of ociety, is peculiarly equipped to make.

I speak, as no doubt you are aware, in terms of phere sovereignty. I ask that the school be per- nitted to carry out its primary mission without eing distracted from it by the demands of other pheres of society which prefer to foist their re- ponsibilities on some other agency. The school, I epeat, *cannot* do the whole job, was never in- ended to do the whole job, and must not attempt o do the whole job, lest in trying to do all it do nothing well — and that is exactly what many a nodern school is doing today. I do not propose to nter a discussion of whether or not Johnny can read better than his parents could at his age. As far as I am concerned, the question is irrelevant. I will merely observe that, in far too many cases, Johnny cannot read as well as he should and could, and that the common complaint of employers is that a high school diploma is no guarantee whatso- ever of even the bare mastery of communication skills which should have been acquired on the primary level. And one reason for this is that the school's time has been taken up in the teaching of subjects which it is not the business of the school to teach. There is a good deal of truth in the cartoon which I saw recently in which a young stenographer was complaining to a friend: "I worked like a slave in that personality course, and all the boss ever talks to me about is my spelling."

What lies at the root of this misconception of the school's function has been noted by Robert Hutchins.

> The crucial error [he says] is that of holding that nothing is more important than anything else, that there can be no order of intellectual goods . . . nothing central, nothing peripheral, nothing basic, and nothing superficial. (Quoted in H. Zylstra, *Testament of Vision*, p. 133.)

Hence the popular demand that Janie be taught to bake a cherry pie — even at the cost, alas, of Janie's education. And that Johnny be taught to play the violin on school time. And that his brother be taught the rudiments of home carpentry even though his manual training interfere with the course which is designed to develop his humanity and make him more than merely a do-it-yourself home repairman. Time will not permit my treating all the excrescences of the modern curriculum individually. I wish only to say that the home has its share of responsibility in "developing the whole man" and that if, for example, it is desirable that Janie learn to cook and to bake, Janie's mother might well drop her bridge club, her fund-raising society, her hen parties and *koffee kletzes*, or her wage-earning job to attend to her real job as Janie's mother. She cannot, unless she is an extraordinary mother, take on herself the direct responsibility for Janie's formal education. We recognize that fact when we set up our Christian school system. But she can and must teach Janie those things which are her particular specialty in the sphere of homemaking. And she can and must be the primary influence in the formation of Janie's character. Much has been said and written lately of the delinquency of parents in this respect. We may well ask ourselves to what extent the schools have contributed to this parental delinquency by offering the type of course which makes it easy for parents to shirk their responsibilities. The home, then, as the basic institution of society must once again do its share in training the child in the non-intellectual aspects of life and leave the school free to perform its function.

Allow me to quote from a recent speech by William H. Cornog, Superintendent of the New Trier Township High School:

> I have watched the bandwagons of citizenship education go by, and I am still unimpressed with all the noise and fury about the school's responsibility to teach manners and courtesy and a decent respect for one's fellow-human beings. This is primarily the job of the home, although a good school will always do it, too, and do it well. [This is one of the "fringe benefits" of which I spoke.] But it never will do it directly, never by indoctrination, never by deep-breathing exercises in the rituals of citizenship, nor, I hope, by emotional and sentimental appeal. You cannot turn out good citizens by state worship or flag worship or memorization of constitutions. The practice of democratic citizenship is a moral habit and its roots are in reason and not emotion. The first commitment which a school must make for both its teachers and its students is the commitment of the training of the mind to reason. . . . The schools are not in business to teach anything to anyone or everything to everyone. They are not to be confused . . . with shopping centers. We do not, I hope, put signs in our school corridors: "What you don't see, ask for." If we have them up, I hope we take down the signs which say: "The customer is always right." (Address to the Conference on the American High School, Chicago, Nov., 1957, quoted in *Council for Basic Education Bulletin*, Dec., 1957.)

It is not only the home that is asking the school to do its job by adding to an already over-crowded curriculum. Everybody wants to get into the act. The current craze is for driver training in the schools. I do not deny that something must be done

to stop the slaughter on the highways. Nor will I even suggest that it is Dad's job to teach Johnny to drive. It may well be that Dad is not competent. But I do emphatically deny that the schools must assume responsibility for this training. As a matter of fact, if the school were free to do its real job, it might well — again as one of the fringe benefits of a liberal education — produce the sort of man whose driving would not contribute to the awful toll in human lives. For, as one of my senior colleagues has wisely pointed out, the adolescent group which is responsible for the greatest percentage of fatalities is precisely the group which is mechanically best equipped to avoid accidents. The adolescent's reflexes are much quicker than those of an older person. His eyesight is generally better. His skill in manipulating a machine might well excite the envy of us older folk. No, what this young person needs is not so much training but humanizing. And the school can do this humanizing job if it is not burdened with these other matters. It can take this humanity of ours and make it "more intelligent... more effectively and more consciously human. [It can] develop, discipline, and mature it." (H. Zylstra, *op. cit.*, p. 142) But it cannot do this if its facilities and the students' time are to be dissipated on an ever-broadening curriculum.

I invite your attention to a letter written by a Georgia high school principal to the editor of the *Constitution* on this matter of curriculum.

> Now we have another suggestion from perfectly sincere people that something else be added. What do you suggest be done about time, money, faculty, and curriculum? Something has to give . . . . You cannot eternally add, attenuate, and emasculate curricula without disastrous results. The end result is that you have a curriculum a mile wide and an inch deep. . . .
>
> Am I arguing against driver training for persons to be licensed? Certainly not! Let the proper agency do it. Just why is not the state patrol or the Department of Safety the proper agency? Why the school? It is the old story of passing on unpleasant tasks to the schools. The result is that schools are very near the point at which they are not educational institutions at all but are in the business of furnishing entertainment to the community via athletics and absorbing discrete functions of parents and community because the school has let itself become a dumping ground. We cannot do everything. . . .
>
> The schools have been scorned and hounded by charges of laxity in spelling, math, and English. For the sake of an argument, just let us say this is so. How is the student going to learn math and spelling and English if, during school hours, he is practicing varsity athletics, baby sitting, repeating health units he's already had, and learning to drive a car? I expect to see . . . articles in the press bemoaning the loss of academic standards. It might be true indeed that such will be the case; and the reasons will be that there were no academic programs to teach, no standards to enforce, and no time to do much. We will end up with a conglomeration of scattergun subjects without log reason, or correlation. (*C. B. E. Bulletin*, Dec., 195

Nor would I exempt business and industry of i share of responsibility. Typing, shorthand, boo keeping, shop, radio repair, watchmaking, pil driving? Fine. And perhaps even in so-calle schools set up especially to teach them. But let th sort of specialized training — which is not ed cation at all — be done after, and not in place o the students' real education. And let the scho get back to its real business of education: the thre R's on the elementary levels, the natural and soci sciences and the humanities on the higher level For in so doing the school will be doing the job is meant to do and contributing well-discipline thoroughly grounded human beings prepared meet the crisis in peace or in war.

BUT IN ORDER to do this, even with a curriculu devoted to the proper materials of educatio the school must also raise its standards. It mus once and for all have done with the notion tha either the student or society is being favored b allowing the student to get by with slipshod work In my considerable experience as a student an my comparatively small experience as a teacher, have found this to be a fact: almost no student wi exert himself to exceed the standards set by th teacher. Let us face it: human beings — you an I included — are naturally inclined to laziness, an much of what the human race has achieved ha been accomplished under some form of compulsion Inspiration and interest also play a part, to b sure. Who of you cannot recall a teacher who in spired you, who whetted your interest to the poin where you outdid yourself? But, unfortunately, no every good teacher is gifted with the sort of per sonality that lends itself to inspiration and inter est. Some of the men who have contributed sig nificantly to my education have been, on the con trary, rather stuffy individuals. But every teache can maintain high standards, provided, of course that he himself is sufficiently enlightened to dis tinguish good work from poor. And if he isn't — well, then let's get him out of the schools until such time as he has become enlightened.

One of the saddest spectacles in the educational world is the intelligent student who comes to college after having been victimized by a lazy, incompetent, or sentimentally motivated teacher who allowed that student to believe that his sub-standard achievements were acceptable work. Sometimes we can straighten out such a student, although it is always a painful process for both the student and the instructor. All too often by the time he comes to us it is already too late to do anything for him.

"What three things are necessary for you to know . . .?" asks the Catechism. And the answer comes back: "First, how great my sins and miseries are." That is good theology. And that is good pedagogy as well. For the ignorant will not repent of his ignorance unless he knows that he is ignorant. And it is one of the teacher's tasks to make him aware of his ignorance. Not by shouting "You are ignorant!" to be sure. For here, again, the Catechism can give us an example. "Whence knowest thou thy sins and miseries?" "Out of the law of God." That is, by comparing what I am to a perfect standard. And so, too, must the teacher make the student, himself, see how he measures up. And the standard I recommend is not mere mediocrity, not mere getting by with the minimal requirements, but perfection — insofar as I myself am capable of ascertaining what perfection is!

That implies, of course, that the teacher must, like the umpire, "call them as he sees them." And just as we would not tolerate an umpire who finds his position behind homeplate with the aid of a seeing-eye dog, we ought not to tolerate in the classroom the teacher who has, on the basis of his own academic experience, no understanding of what perfection is. That implies, further, that the teacher and the school will not put their stamp of approval on the student who has not met the requirements of the grade or the course in which he has enrolled. It implies, if I may use the unpopular term, failing the pupil who has failed. I must confess that I am not greatly impressed by talk of "trauma" and "frustration" and the like. Life is full of frustration, and most of us have had to learn somewhere along the line either to use the obstacle as a stepping stone or to moderate our ambitions in terms of our capabilities. But what I am seriously concerned about is the demoralizing effect of labeling "good" and "acceptable" that which is not good and acceptable at all. It deludes the student, it stultifies his capacity for aspiration, it gives him a distorted picture of himself and of reality, and it contributes to his intellectual and moral degeneration.

All this in terms of the effect of low standards on the student. There is more, and that more tears at the very structure of our educational institutions. The inevitable result of failure to enforce high standards is the necessity of down-grading the quality of education at every level. The student who has not learned what the first grade has to offer will have to be taught that before he goes on to more complicated subject matter. And if that student reaches second grade in any sizeable quantity, the second grade must, perforce, busy itself with the unlearned materials of the first grade — at the cost, of course, of neglecting what the second grade should be offering. And so on through the twelve grades until we who teach English on the college level find it necessary to devote our time to the teaching of junior high school material, including the spelling of such esoteric words as *receive* and *believe* and *committee*.

Here, once more, I must insist that the school cannot do the job by itself. We as parents must cooperate in this matter of raising standards. Teachers and administrators are human beings and are afflicted with all the weaknesses common to humanity. Many of them, I honestly believe most of them, are *eager* to raise the standards in their schools, and here and there one even finds one who *does* raise the standards in his particular class or school. Blessings on his head. We can tell his students from the mass when they come to us for further education. But the average educator dislikes being a martyr and is prone to concede to parental pressure. I even hear the story — I hope it is exaggerated, but it may well be true — of the principal of one of our Christian schools who solved the dilemma by keeping two sets of records, one for parental consumption and one for academic purposes. The notion held by many parents that to make Johnny exercise his intellectual muscles on Latin and geometry might injure his psyche must go if we are to educate for a period of world crisis.

BUT I MUST GO ON, for there are still a few matters that the traditionalist would like to say about education in these times.

One of these concerns the danger of positing a utilitarian goal as the objective of education. This danger has always been a very real one in America. Now, this ever-present danger of utilitarianism, pragmatism, professionalism, vocationalism, materialism — call it what you will — is greatly increased in times of national emergency. I am more than pleased to hear the loud demands for mathematics, physics, chemistry, and the like. But I am somewhat disturbed to note, all too often, a complete lack of demand for the hard study of the social sciences and the humanities. Not only that, but I am very much afraid that what many people mean when they demand a return to the subject matter of the natural sciences is not so much a study of science, as a form of technical training. We shall have to be careful lest in our frenzy to produce as many so-called scientists as Russia has, we begin turning out not scientists, but pure technicians — people acquainted with the practical application of one infinitesimal phase of science in a highly specialized *job*.

From a purely practical point of view, that would be bad enough. You scientists know more about this than I do, but I believe it to be a truism that without pure research technological progress

itself must soon come to a standstill. The disinterested research of Einstein, I am told, is responsible for the new science of nuclear physics. What we must avoid, then, for purely practical reasons, is that old evil of professionalism and its younger brother, vocationalism.

The danger of professionalism and vocationalism is being increasingly recognized in educational, professional, and industrial circles. For some time, now, the professional schools have been telling the colleges: "Don't try to *train* your students. *Educate* them. We'll take care of their training." Time was when a pre-med student increased his chances of admission to a medical school by filling up his elective hours with courses in the natural sciences. Those days are gone. The medical schools, at least, have recognized what the traditionalist has long held to be true, namely, that a man is essentially a human being and only secondarily a doctor, lawyer, or physicist.

Similarly, there is a growing feeling that teachers ought to be liberally educated before professionalizing. In several states there are experiments in which teacher training as such is being put off until the prospective teacher has completed four years of a liberal arts curriculum. And at Calvin we are seriously considering whether the future minister should not spend five instead of four years in college, the theory being that so much of the pre-sem's four years is spent in mastering the tools which a good high school student used to get that he has little opportunity to become educated. And even a minister is essentially a human being and only secondarily a minister.

Industry, too, and business have begun to recognize the need for a humanizing education instead of mere training for professional competence. In recent years several large corporations have been sending their executives back to college, three months at a time, to study — not, as one might suppose, matters directly related to ther positions as executives, but history, economics, philosophy, and the fine arts — those subjects related to their essential humanness.

The fact is that the best preparation for any kind of work in our modern society is a liberal education. There is a more basic reason for insisting on a liberal education, to be sure; I merely offer this in refutation of the argument that a liberal education has no practical value. Let me read you a paragraph from a recent issue of *Time* (Mar. 3, 1958, p. 39):

> In Detroit, at the request of School Superintendent Samuel Brownell, a committee of businessmen and teachers tackled the question of just how much vocational training should be given high-school students who will not go on to college. Since the techniques of industry change so rapidly, said the committee, probably the best vocational education is the best vocational: Recommended basic curriculum: "Englis (literature, composition, grammar) throughout th four years; two years of history; a year of plane g ometry and one year of elementary algebra; a year c biology and at least one year of a physical science; a opportunity to elect trigonometry and solid geometr and a second year of physical science; music and a as electives; physical education and other nonacademi offerings properly subordinated to the academic. This or a similar program, should be the basic curriculur for any high school — academic, business or voca tional."

Not bad, that. Still a bit light in the social sci ences and humanities, but considerably better tha what has been passing for education in many modern high school. And it says essentially wha Superintendent Brownell might have learned b reading John Henry Newman. Listen:

> This then is how I should solve the fallacy . . . b which Locke and his disciples would frighten us fro cultivating the intellect, under the notion that no edu cation is useful which does not teach us some tempora calling, or some mechanical art, or some physical se cret. I say that a cultivated intellect . . . brings wit it a power and a grace to every work and occupatio which it undertakes, and enables us to be more usefu and to a greater number . . . and that . . . liberal edu cation, if it refuses the foremost place to professiona interests, does but postpone them to the formation c the citizen. . . .
>
> It is the education which . . . teaches him to se things as they are, to go right to the point, to disen tangle a skein of thought. . . . It prepares him to fi any post with credit, and to master any subject wit facility. (*Knowledge Viewed in Relation to Professio al Skill*)

I mentioned a moment ago that there was reason more cogent than the utilitarian argumen for a liberal education. It is this: the times cr for the humanizing influence of liberal educatio It is not enough to produce the most and the bes scientists. What is needed today, perhaps mor than ever before, is *human beings,* men whose in tellects have been disciplined and informed, men — in short — whose *humanity* has been developed Whether the future will bring peace or war, th safety of our country and the preservation of th cultural values of Western civilization will depen on whether we have produced a generation o human beings or a generation of craftsmen. Ther is currently a great deal of emphasis on under standing our neighbors. And rightly so. For mis understanding creates suspicion and fear and hat and war. I suggest, in passing, that the greates contributor to such misunderstanding is provincial ism, a lack of knowledge of how the other man live and thinks. And I suggest, further, that the mar of the liberally educated person is a sort of cos mopolitanism in the sense that it comprehends an appreciates cultures which are foreign to his own

Beyond that, I should like to remind you tha human values can be and have been lost by defaul

as well as by defeat. The Roman empire had died long before the invaders from the North carved its tombstone. A technical, or even a purely scientific, education for many or most of the citizens might well have been appropriate to the kind of social structure envisioned by Plato, in which the rule was in the hands of an intellectual and moral aristocracy and in which all below the Guardian class carried out their highly specialized duties and deferred to the direction of the rulers in all things. It may have been appropriate to Nazi Germany, although there is a strong possibility that the weaknesses inherent in the system lost Germany the war. But it is certainly not appropriate to a democracy in which the vote of every citizen has as much weight as that of his neighbor's and in which every native male has the chance to become the Chief Executive. No. Democratic society is not like that in Plato's Republic, in Hitler's Germany, or, for that matter, in any army. Here "there are no expert thinkers to do the thinking, expert voters to do the voting, expert governors to do the governing. Public life is not a matter of prescription, civil service, and police. [The average citizen] must do more than [his] job. [He] must determine policy." (H. Zylstra, *op. cit.*, p. 156).

And I repeat what I have already quoted from Newman, that "liberal education, if it refuses the foremost place to professional interests, does but postpone them *to the formation of the citizen.*"

One thing more, and I have done. It has no doubt occurred to many of you that in all this I have said very little about distinctively Christian education in a period of crisis. True. And for two reasons. The first is that I have presented what I believe can be and ought to be speedily achieved in the realm of public education. And the second is that in terms of curriculum and standards there will be no essential difference between a liberal education as I have defined it and a Christian education. There is, however, a significant difference between the two, and that is a matter not of merely adding Bible and chapel exercises to the curriculum or eliminating here a course in science and there a course in the humanities because these areas are out of bounds to the children of the covenant. Nor is it a matter — in terms of standards now — of condoning slipshod workmanship or pietistic clichés in place of intellectual achievement because, as I have heard it pleaded, "they are all covenant children."

It is not a matter of simple addition to or subtraction from the ideal of a liberal education. It is the infinitely more complex matter of viewing our whole educational enterprise in the light of a basic and all-pervading commitment to Christ. For it is true, as Dr. Lambert Flokstra, Chairman of the Department of Education, Calvin College, points out in his essay entitled *Christian Education — Tradition or Conviction?* that

> Created in the image of God, man is ineradicably religious. He must worship at some shrine. . . .
>
> . . . [Education] involves the issues of nature, culture, and religious commitment or dogma, and it is the third of these which pervades the other two.
>
> It is one's religious faith which gives meaning and a sense of direction to all of natural existence and cultural activity. It is one's dogma which provides a fixed point of reference, the unifying principle, for the interpretation of all the phenomena of life.

Newman's liberal education aims at the formation of the citizen who will be fit to take his place in a democracy and defend it from dangers within and without. But Christian education aims at much more. It aims at the formation of the citizen, not first of all of any earthly realm, but of the Kingdom of God, whose citizens are not merely voters and makers of policy, but whose very subjects are prophets, priests, and kings.

"Let us . . . note well that when we handle the word of God, we must have a certain end in view if we are to avoid rambling. We must speak distinctly and to the point, knowing the purpose of our speaking, in order that our discourse not be extravagant and wandering. We might otherwise be able to say a great many good things, but what good would it do? . . . We must take into consideration those persons to whom the teaching is addressed. I am not here for myself alone. It is true that all of us must profit in common, for when I enter the pulpit it is not to teach others only. I do not set myself apart, for I too am to be instructed and the word which issues from my mouth is to serve me as well as you, or woe to me! If I, however, were content to come before you to present the message I have without having considered you or your capacity, what good would it serve? We must, then, show wisdom by accommodating the message to those whom God has placed in our charge, for He places us under obligation to His people when He establishes us as His messengers. He unites us to His Church, and we must have an adequate and true perspective. If we cast our words to the wind, closing our eyes and having no consideration for those to whom we speak, we unjustly and excessively abuse the word of God. For this reason let us note well that they who have this charge to teach, when they speak to a people, are to decide which teaching will be good and profitable so that they will be able to disseminate it faithfully and with discretion to the usefulness of everyone individually."

Calvin, *Sermon XCV* on Job, Op. XXXIV, 423-424

The Witness of Our Worship Service

by Hugh Koops

CONFRONTED BY THE FACT that the unchurched are attending the worship services, the average Christian Reformed minister is continually facing the problem: What kind of message must I bring? Must I present a message for a people I can assume to be believers, and thus endeavor to establish them more firmly in their faith? Or must I bring a message which clearly presents the Saviour to those who have never met Him before? Do I prepare a message suited for the unbeliever, or do I preach for the benefit of the child of God?

The solution to this dilemma is no simple one. The fact remains that a different message is demanded by a different audience. Paul did not speak to the unbelievers in Lystra and Athens as he wrote to the church in various cities. This necessity of a different message for believer and for unbeliever has long been used to defend the distinction between church and chapel. Slowly, but correctly, this distinction is losing its validity. The church of Jesus Christ is not to be divided. No church can afford to miss the opportunity of hearing the call to decision. Nor can any chapel afford to pass by the need of her members for edification in the faith. And thus the problem remains.

This problem is usually left with the preacher. Each minister, and especially the one who is aware of the fact that any Sunday may occasion the visit of an unchurched individual, tries to preserve a proper balance between salvation and edification. Yet he wonders, when the Lord's day ends, whether he has done his best. He wonders, further, whether his best is satisfactory. Has his message touched the heart of the visitor? Has God's Word, spoken through him, also prepared the believer for a life of fuller Christian service?

AFTER FACING this problem for some time I would like to suggest that we have not been formulating this problem as accurately as we can. Is it possible that we preachers are too inclined to evaluate only that portion of the worship service for which we sense an intimate and personal responsibility? We ask the question: What kind of a message must I bring? And we forget that a question of even greater importance, and certainly broader scope, for the man in the pew is this: What kind of a service is this? The more significant question deals not simply with the message, but with the entire worship service including th message. The question is not only one which th preacher must evaluate in his study as he prepare his sermon: the problem is one which the entir congregation must face as it participates in eac worship service. The witness is not only that o the preacher; testimony is borne by the entir church.

This problem came to the fore one day when discussed Christian Reformed worship service with an individual who had attended these service occasionally. This man was impressed by the bib lical character of the messages delivered in th Christian Reformed Church. He said that he nc where heard messages so dependent upon the Wor of God. But this did not mean that he was eage to join the Christian Reformed Church. Definitel not! For he noticed that no one in the audienc verbally expressed agreement with the messag (he was unaware of the comments made at th door after the service). During the sermon no on said "Amen." Several times he had wanted to d so, but he noticed that the audience never spon taneously took part in the service. Thus he aske the embarrassing question: "Do you really believ that there are born-again Christians in you church?"

How does one answer this question? One ca criticize the redundancy of the over-used phrase "born-again Christian." One can point out tha the "Amen" does not guarantee the regenerate spirit of the individual. One can recall the truth that no one of us is qualified to judge the spiritua state of another. One can point out that there ar other ways through which the members of ou church express their Christian faith. But the fac remains. At no place within the worship servic does the congregation voluntarily give testimon of her Christian faith. Thus the problem is raise before the church. What can she do to show to he guests not only the faith of her preacher but als the faith of the congregation? The question con cerns not only the message but the entire worshi service. It is not the minister's problem; it is a problem for the church.

Any examination of our worship service de velops a growing appreciation of the communio expressed between God and the congregation with in our liturgy. After God speaks in the salutation

he congregation responds with a hymn of praise. After God speaks through the Law, the people reply with a confession of sin. After God speaks of the assurance of pardon following a sincere confession, the congregation responds through a psalm of gratitude. The entire liturgy is built upon the principle of communion between God and His people. The whole service is one of inter-play: God speaks, and the church responds.

Our problem arises, however, from the fact that the response of the congregation is never spontaneous. The audience never participates of her own initiative. Although each member joins in the singing, the selections are chosen by the minister. Although each takes part in the profession of faith, the words of the Apostles' Creed have been chosen by tradition. When the church prays, she prays through the pastor. Even when responsive readings of the Law are introduced, the form used is used by everyone and is passed out at the door to all. The congregation participates, but the manner of her participation is decided for her.

RECOGNITION of the need for congregational participation is not sufficient. What is also necessary is that this participation be evident to the visitor. Those familiar with our liturgy may appreciate the conversation that takes place between God and the church in our worship service. But what about those who do not know our liturgy? Will they recognize the participation of the congregation in this fellowship with God?

Ever since the Reformation Protestant thought has demanded the participation of the congregation in the worship service. A criticism of Catholicism frequently made is that at the Catholic mass the worshipper is merely an observer and never a participant. Today the Catholic Church is dealing with this criticism, and is making room for more lay participation within the worship service. For some Roman Catholics this simply means conducting the service in the vernacular, or making translations of the Latin available so that everyone can participate intelligently, i.e., at least know what is being said within the service. This method of congregational participation has long been used by all Reformed churches.

It is now time for Protestants to ask whether they can be satisfied with a solution found many years ago. Does the use of the common language guarantee participation by the members of the congregation? And, more significantly, does the use of the common language declare to others the faith of the members of the congregation? The church today must consider the use of other methods in order that she may declare to those who witness her worship services this truth: the church as a whole participates in this service. And, in her search for other methods, the church should avoid the formal. (This does not mean the church should avoid the dignified.) She should look for that which is free and voluntary. Spontaneity does not insure sincerity, but it communicates sincerity more readily to a neutral or even hostile audience.

LOOKING CLOSELY at our liturgy one soon notices the dual role of the minister in the worship service. Most obviously the voice of the preacher represents the voice of God. This is apparent in the salutation or greeting, the reading of the Law, the assurance of pardon (where included), the reading of Scripture, the sermon, and the benediction. But at other times the voice of the minister stands for the congregation. This is especially so in the prayers: the congregational or pastoral prayer and the prayer following the sermon.

It is this feature of our present worship service that is rather confusing, and especially so for the uninitiate. The role of the minister varies. At one moment he represents God; at the next he represents the church. Or, to speak in different terms, at one time he appears as prophet, at another as priest. Sometimes he speaks for God to the people; at other times he speaks for the people to God.

The minister has been ordained as prophet. For this role he has been set aside. But he is under no particular obligation to function as priest for the church. As an individual he certainly prays for the church — as does every member. This is not, however, a function of his prophetic office. Prayer for the church is a priestly task. The priestly function has been given specifically to the deacon. Surely the deacon represents the church in the ministry of mercy. Why not in the ministry of prayer? He stands as the church before the poor. Should he not also represent the church before the throne of grace?

One must, of course, consider what effect such a prayer might make upon the occasional guest at the worship service. Would such a visitor be familiar with the priestly role of the deacon? In many cases it might be better for the church to emphasize the priesthood of all believers. This she can do best by having various members of the congregation, in addition to the members of the consistory, lead the church in her prayers.

The greatest objection to such a change in procedure, it seems to me, is the fact that, because the pastor is best acquainted with the needs of the congregation, he is best qualified to represent the congregation in prayer. In many instances this may be true. But we should remember that we no long-

er live in an age in which the minister alone is educated. Many others are also qualified to analyze the spiritual needs of the church. This is clearly seen when we note that many of our ministers are not natives of the communities where their churches are located. Moreover, when the privilege of leading in prayer is offered to many within the church it should be obvious that the many can better represent the church than the one. Perhaps any one prayer by the minister is more representative of the needs of the congregation than any one prayer by another. But the many prayers by many members of the church will be even more representative of the needs of the church.

There are other ways in which the church can express her participation in the service, especially in the congregational prayer. In many churches the congregation unites at the conclusion of the congregational prayer in using the Lord's Prayer. Another possibility is the use of congregational kneeling during the congregational prayer. We recommend both procedures — in addition to an extemporary prayer led by a member of the congregation. In a time when the formal is charged with insincerity, extemporary prayer by a member of the congregation best precludes such criticism.

THE ADVANTAGES of such an order of worship, with the prayers of the congregation led by a representative from the congregation, are several. The congregation will have a specific place within the service. The variety in prayer will aid individual attentiveness. The preacher will not only be recognized as a member of the congregation in the pastoral prayer, but his particular function as mouth-piece of God will gain in prominence. The entire nature of the service will become more evident. The conversation between God and His people will become dramatically apparent.

Some may object and say that such a change is not enough to guarantee the participation of each member of the church. This is quite true. No method can guarantee spiritual participation. But as long as some method must be used, should we not use that method which safeguards the prophetic office of the minister and makes obvious, if not certain, the participation of the congregation?

Others may add that the participation of the audience can be felt by those who are present. This is also true, and every preacher thrills to the experience of speaking to an audience eagerly listening to the proclamation of the Word of God. But we must remember that this response, while recognized by those who belong to the church, is completely foreign to the guest.

Whatever method of congregational participation is to be used, it is fitting for us to consider Paul's advice to the Corinthian church regarding the nature of the worship service. The circumstances were quite different from what they are today. Certain gifts were present then that are not to be found in the church today. But Paul was very insistent that those gifts which remained unintelligible to the outsider be excluded from the worship service. If one were to speak he should speak intelligibly, so that all could participate. Paul writes:

> But if all prophesy, and there come in one unbelieving or unlearned, he is reproved by all, he is judged by all; the secrets of his heart are made manifest; and so he will fall down on his face and worship God, declaring that God is among you indeed. (I Cor. 14:24f.)

The significant thing to note about this passage is that the unbelieving and ignorant one is reproved and judged not only by the words of one individual conducting the service, but by the testimony of all. It is not the minister, but the church; it is not alone the sermon, but the entire worship service which forces the unbeliever to acknowledge the presence of God. It is not alone the Word, but also the response of the congregation to the Word, which leads the ignorant to worship God.

Because each member of the church is called upon to serve as a witness within the church, it is very important that we consider his active role in the worship service. Generally the man in the pew is better acquainted with the unbeliever than the man in the pulpit. He is better prepared to address the unbeliever because he lives in the same world, and must make his faith relevant to that world.

Within the worship service there is no place more fitting for congregational participation than in the congregational prayer. Seldom does one's faith become as evident as in one's prayers, for seldom is one as conscious of God's presence as while praying. Moreover, there is little danger of incorrect or inaccurate theology in prayer. Abraham Kuyper has written, and for this statement received the wholehearted endorsement of Benjamin B. Warfield:

> There is no Christian, be he Lutheran or Baptist, Methodist or Greek, whose prayer is not thoroughly Calvinistic; no child of God, to whatever church organization he may belong, but in his prayer he gives glory to God above and renders thanks to his Father in heaven for all the grace working in him, and acknowledges that the eternal love of God alone has, in the face of his resistance, drawn him out of darkness into light.

We advocate, for the quickening of the life of the church and for the greater effectiveness of her testimony, that the congregation be given her rightful place in the worship service. We ask the church to take her prayers upon herself.

BOOK REVIEWS —

In the Mirror, by J. H. Kromminga, 176 pages, $2.90. Hamilton, Ontario, Canada: Guardian Publishing Co., 1957.

Reviewed by Lester DeKoster.

This is a challenging book from a responsible observer. The author has no wish that the Christian Reformed Church should view itself in his mirror and "straightway forget what manner" of church it is. Rather, he obviously intends that we see ourselves as we are in order that we may the more become what we are called to be. His delineation is clear, and his aspirations are stimulating. His style is concise, easy, and readable.

There are six chapters, each prefaced with a quotation. Heading chapter 1 are several verses from I Corinthians, ending with a sentence which sets the theme of the book: "He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." In the Lord alone would Dr. Kromminga have the CRC rejoice in its blessings, which are many; and in the Lord alone would he have the CRC set its foot upon a second century with aspirations for leavening ever-widening circles of American and Canadian life.

Roots and Soil. Out of a Reformation background, and rooted in God's Word, comes the heritage the CRC enjoys. It is a heritage purified by struggle, and one which blends together the warmth of the *Afscheiding* with the intellectual insights and budding social consciousness of the *Doleantie.* It is a heritage brought to this continent by immigrants, and developed in reaction to, and upon, a new land.

Alone and Together. Our forebears, faced with the immensity, diversity, and veritable cacophony of a vast continent surging with life, sought at first to protect their faith by isolation. They hoped to remain — most of them — an island of stability amidst the violent stream of change which tended to level distinctions while it frothed into new forms of life and worship. Seizing upon the freedom which America afforded them to go their own way, most of our fathers sought isolation in order to resist Americanization, fearing that contact meant conformity in life and in doctrine. They built many fences to shut America out: the long-continued use of the Dutch language; reliance largely upon continued immigration for their growth; dependence upon the Netherlands for theological leadership; separate day schools for insulation as well as for education; separate agencies of various kinds; and, above all, as a continuing phenomenon, "the isolationist mentality."

This "mentality" the author defines as the idea "that the church can preserve itself by strict concern for itself; and that it is legitimate for the church to do so." And it is precisely, Dr. Kromminga says, at the juncture where the legitimate concern with the purity of doctrine and loyalty of life meets the equally legitimate call to leaven the society in which the church is placed that we "are near the very heart of the problem of the CRC today."

Why not isolationism? Dr. Kromminga discerns two "perils of isolationism": (1) it "leads to a lack of effect of the church on its environment"; and (2) "it has a negative effect on the life of the church itself."

The first "peril" exists because influence can only be exerted by contact. The candle under the bushel illuminates little. Let the CRC, therefore, seriously consider membership in interdenominational organizations, not to betray but to proclaim its faith. Let it evangelize with all its might, secure in the knowledge that those whom we "compel to come in" will not sully but will enrich our witness. But, be it ever remembered, contact *may not be* — and *need not be* — conformity.

The second "peril" of isolationism exists because preoccupation with self-preservation results for the church in "an exaggerated perspective of the difficulties within its own boundaries." Again, "for lack of something more important to do, such a church adds precept upon precept and demands that everybody toe the mark which is drawn." Further, isolationism "fosters a diminished view of the needs of the world," and as a corollary, "a shrunken conception of the task of the church. The task becomes a mere holding of the line rather than an advance." The candle under the bushel threatens to exhaust the oxygen by which it burns.

Were this all that needed saying, the author continues, "the course of profitable action would be clear." But, leaving the haven of isolation for vigorous contact with its environment confronts the CRC with dangers which it must clearly discern: the temptations to keep silent "on anything that is theologically distinctive"; the loss of evangelical impact through theological conformitory; insensitivity to cultural problems as illustrated by the pitfalls which threaten "mixed marriages"; indifference to the distinctions between "genuine evangelical zeal and Arminianism, between social concern and the 'social gospel,' between Christianity and mere churchgoing." But these very real dangers can be a spur to action if met in faith; and forearmed with this awareness the CRC finds that "the only possible course of action seems to be to retain and develop such an isolation as will produce distinctiveness — genuine distinctiveness; and then to proceed with that distinctiveness into aggressive contact."

But are we ready for contact now? There are reasons for answering *No*: the widespread lack of a profound understanding of our doctrines; a sometimes "wooden and unimaginative" approach to practical problems, as in the case of amusements; a neglect by the pulpit of significant preaching on social themes such as "divorce, labor relations, war and peace, and atomic power"; a reluctance to make contemporary problems "our business" as evidenced in the reasoning on which Synod of 1957 based its refusal to adopt the race resolutions proposed by one classis.

And yet, the CRC does have, the author insists, the "spiritual resources" to seek contact without undue fear of conformity: its foundation is "as sound as it can be — the Word of God and its interpretation through the creeds"; and the majority of its membership are "deeply committed to the service and praise of God."

The
Crucial Task
of
Theology

E. Ashby Johnson. In a unique and lucid analysis, the author compares the scope and methods of theology with the scope and methods of science and modern philosophy. In this day of crisis, the major task facing theology is to establish the basis on which its claim to knowledge rests.

Albert C. Outler writes: "If more people knew more clearly what theology really is — and is up to — the theological revival would gain substance and depth in the contemporary scene. Professor Johnson's book . . . affords just such a needed guide to the study and practice of theology." $5.00

Guilt
and
Redemption

Lewis J. Sherrill. In this revised edition, Dr. Sherrill has drawn from the Bible and theology, from psychiatry and psychology, to illumine the depths of guilt and the plan of salvation. Help for pastoral counseling. $3.50

ask your bookseller

JOHN KNOX PRESS

One and Many. But, asks the author, has the CRC the internal unity requisite to effective contact with its world? Differences among us there are indeed, but the biblically based conviction that "the Church of Jesus Christ should be one Church" does not imply that "unity means uniformity." The CRC is the richer because of the diversity caused by wide geographical distribution of its congregations with resultant sectional concerns, because of the various waves of immigration bringing with them differing emphases and interpretations, because of the (relatively few) members who have been assimilated from non-Dutch backgrounds, and because of the theological discussions concerning the relation of the church to its environment, concerning common grace, and about divorce.

These, and other, differences can continue to enrich the CRC in unity, if it be remembered that no one can claim perfection, that our heritage "allows for some latitude within the creeds," and that we subscribe to the Conclusions of Utrecht which bespeak a "breadth of insight and approach" in the interpretation of Scripture and doctrine. Let our unity ever rest, the author concludes, in observing "throughout the church the Scriptural demands of love and consideration for the neighbor . . . . The members must count others better than themselves."

Faith and Action. Is the CRC organized now for effectual contact with its environment? In reply, the author observes that theological activity is widespread. But concern with, and understanding of, present theological trends outside the CRC is sporadic and relatively uncommon. Further, our own theological contributions have often lacked freshness and been of little impact on current theological thinking. What is needed, Dr. Kromminga holds, is "fresh recourse to the Word, in which respect the church is far outstripped by some of the modern theologians whom it criticizes." In this respect, he looks to the institution he heads for renewed theological leadership and fruitfulness.

But the faith and loyalty of the CRC have not been fruitless: divine worship flourishes; catechization is thorough; society life continues; Christian schools grow; institutions of mercy develop apace.

Church and Neighbor. The CRC is experiencing "an awakened and growing mission consciousness," represented in a world-wide geographical range and a substantial expenditure of denominational funds. This encouraging evidence of moving out into its world on the plane of missions is not matched, however, by the CRC's developing ecumenical contacts. Such contacts are maintained neither with those of our own beliefs nor with the world-wide ecumenical bodies. The N.A.E. at least gave us a chance to hear and to be heard, and "the reopening of our association with it would be desirable." Whether we should move toward relations with the World Council depends "on what the WC is. If it is merely a consultative agenc membership might be profitable. it is a service agency, engaging in th work of the church while disregardin radical differences along the mem bers, membership is not appealing. But this is a question neither the CR nor the World Council is able at pre ent to answer. At least, however, " goes without saying that the progre of the World Council should be fo lowed with careful attention."

Our association with the Reforme Ecumenical Synod promises to b fruitful as that organization mov toward becoming a "real synod, wit a kind of authority recognized by a member churches," who through might speak to, and develop conta with, similar organizations.

Past and Future. The questio which throng about this turn of a ce tury in the life of the CRC are man and will be many as the years go b And they may be faced with con dence, not in reliance upon a heritag of one hundred years, nor in th strength of many blessings, but onl in dependence upon the living Chris In Him the threats and fear of yeste day become the challenges and cou age of tomorrow.

Running throughout the book is discussion of that part of the CR which is established in Canada. Th similarities between the Canadian an U.S. environments "far outweigh" th differences, Dr. Kromminga holds and the variety of emphases whic from time to time appear between Ca nadian and American brethren "reflec much more the clash between ol world and new than between Canad and the U.S."

The American branch has liberall aided the immigrant church in Can ada, and the Dutch-Canadians hav generously adopted the CRC with a its faults as their own. The combine branches, as they continue to develo unity out of diversity, will furthe fructify each other and will forge thei treasures of tradition and experienc into tools for making "maximum im pact" upon the thought and life of th Canadian-American scene.

Thus Dr. Kromminga points th CRC to, and then through, his mirro for a vision of itself as it is and as i may be. It takes courage to expose a church to itself; it requires vision t point the way of growth and service and it demands sustained conviction t seek to guide the feet of leaders alon

hat way. That the author combines he first two characteristics in humble ith bodes well for his success in the ird.

This brief summary of a provocative and thoughtful book should be no substitute for the careful attention which it deserves.

merican Literature and Christian Doctrine, by Randall Stewart, 155 ages. $3.50. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1958. eviewed by Peter Oppewall, Assistant Professor of English, Calvin College.

The appearance of this work is an ccasion for rejoicing by all Christian udents of American life and letters, nd should be a matter of great inter- st to those concerned with the inter- elationship of literature and faith. It ffers something rare in the annals of merican literary criticism: an analy- is of leading American writers from n orthodox Christian point of view y a competent literary critic. Ran- all Stewart is chairman of the depart- ent of English at Vanderbilt and is a eading Hawthorne scholar. Though Baptist by birth and training (his ather was a Baptist minister and to his he attributes his familiarity with heological ideas), he is now an Epis- opalian.

Working within the whole domain f American literature, one could hard- y be authoritative or complete. Stew- rt's work is frankly tentative and ex- loratory. Nevertheless, it makes a olid and substantial contribution from distinctive Christian point of view o the understanding and possibly even o the re-interpretation of several ma- or American writers. Because of the revious lack of such estimates, it has lready been called a landmark in American literary criticism. Stewart opes that it will be the harbinger of more complete and thorough treat- ents to come, and we can wholehearted- dly share this wish.

The author has lessened the huge scope of his work somewhat by con- entrating on only a few themes and on our most representative writers. His main assumption is that the most im- portant question which may be asked of any writer is his view of the nature of man. The more orthodox this view, the more likely that what the writer says will have lasting significance. Though he recognizes five criteria for orthodoxy (the sovereignty of God, the divinity of Christ, original sin, the atonement, the inspiration of the Scriptures), he wishes to make a recog- nition of original sin the test of literary orthodoxy. We sense immediately the limitations of holding mainly to this one criterion for orthodoxy, but we should not conclude that it completely vitiates what he has to say. Recently there has been increasing attention paid by writers and critics to the concept of original sin. T. E. Hulme, progenitor of the revival of religious interest in modern literature, said original sin was "the closest expression of the religious attitude." T. S. Eliot, chief instrument of this revival, said,

> With the disappearance of the idea of Original Sin, with the disappearance of the idea of intense moral struggle, the human beings presented for us in prose fiction today . . . tend to become less and less real. It is in fact in moments of moral and spiritual struggle, depending upon spiritual sanctions, rather than in those bewildering minutes in which we are all very much alike, that men and women come nearest to being real. If you do away with this struggle . . . you must expect human beings to become more and more vaporous.

Even an enemy of orthodoxy like Kathleen Nott maintains that original sin "is certainly the psychological foundation of Christian orthodoxy."

We can only guess at the reasons for this pronounced stress on one particular doctrine by writers and critics alike. Is it because the writer is more directly concerned with the nature of man than the nature of God? Is it because he finds it easier to make relevant the doctrine of original sin than those of the sovereignty of God, the divinity of Christ, the atonement, the inspiration of Scripture? Is it because he clings to the idea that his conception of God must arise out of his conception of man, rather than the reverse? Is it a matter of revolt, conscious or unconscious, against the romantic view of man, which saw him as relatively sinless and ultimately perfectible, and the naturalistic view, which saw evil as resident only in institutions and never in the heart of man?

Be that as it may, we had best be consoled with the thought that Stewart might easily have lighted on less significant aspects of orthodoxy. It may not be true, as Stewart seems to imply, that a low opinion of the estate of man requires a balancing view of the sovereignty of God, but at least these writers have arrived at a knowledge of the first of the three things necessary to their salvation. Also it represents large and really basic improvement over previous views of man which have been widely current in our literature.

Stewart treats consecutively: the Puritan legacy as embodied chiefly in Jonathan Edwards; the age of Reason with Deists Franklin, Paine, and Jefferson; the chief Romantics, Emerson and Whitman; the "Counter-Romantics," Hawthorne, Melville, and Henry James; the Naturalists, particularly Crane and Dreiser; and the return to Christian commitment in Eliot, Tate, R. P. Warren, and Faulkner. The orthodox view of man was, of course, lost in the 18th century when America followed the lead of "a great pagan skeptic" Franklin instead of "the most complete of all American Calvinists" Edwards. Stewart shows how it was further distorted and corrupted under the Romantics. He sees more clearly than most critics that it was Emerson's blurring of the distinction between man and nature, between nature and God, and consequently between man and God which led to the ultimate deification of man, so nakedly and unashamedly sung by Walt Whitman. He sees also the widespread influence of Emer-

PULPIT ROBES

You always look your best, are your best in a BENTLEY & SIMON pulpit robe. Hand-sewn and custom-tailored for perfect fit, for lasting enjoyment.

CHOIR ROBES, too, individually made in the same quality way.

Your Standard of Excellence since 1912

Write for catalog F-7

BENTLEY & SIMON INC
7 West 36 St., New York 18, N. Y.

son's thinking in Emerson's own time, which survives in the popular mind today. Emerson's "Trust thyself" has become "Every man for himself," and so he calls Emerson "the arch-heretic of American literature and Emersonism the greatest heresy." He feels that "Emerson's thinking has done more than any other doctrine to undermine Christian belief in America."

Meanwhile, Melville and Hawthorne were picking their treacherous way between the cold austerities of a dying Puritanism and the dizzying celestial railroad of the Transcendentalists. They survived, maintaining their spiritual and artistic integrity mainly by a lingering and sometimes obsessive awareness of the nature of evil. Henry James, too, was much concerned with "loss of innocence, and the snares of a refined egotism." Stewart sums up his argument on these writers:

> I call Hawthorne, Melville, and James "counter-romantics" because they recognize Original Sin, because they show the conflict between good and evil, because they show man's struggle toward redemption, because they dramatize the necessary role of suffering in the purification of the self. They do not apotheosize the self, as romantics like Emerson and Whitman do, but warn against its perversities, its obsession, its insidious deceptions. They side with the orthodox, traditional Christian view of man and the world.

The naturalists, adopting scientific determinism, made man a victim, a puppet — "ruled by forces from without or forces from within, or both." Stewart calls them the "Amoralists" and shows how they relieved man of human responsibility. He contends that much work in the social sciences today is still based on "a glandular determinism." St. Paul's "I can do all things through Christ" has become "I can do only those things which my psychological profile shows that I have aptitude for, and I should be silly to try anything else."

The modern conservative movement Stewart sees as a reaction to 19th-century liberalism. He sees it derived largely from T. S. Eliot, and carried on in this country by southern writers, chiefly Allen Tate, Robert Penn Warren, and William Faulkner. I believe this last section to be the weakest part of the book. In his eagerness to find a return to a Christian view of man in modern writers, Stewart seems sometimes to be grasping at straws: the bartender in Hemingway's "A Clean Well-Lighted Place" becomes a ministering priest, and the café a symbol for the communion of the saints; the dog Lion in Faulkner's "The Bear" becomes "the Lion of Juda" and thus a type of Christ; the idiot Benjy in *The Sound and the Fury* "recalls Christ in his innocence and his sorrowfulness." These show us the perils, pitfalls, and possible excesses in the interpretation of a writer's conscious or unconscious symbolism. It must be conceded that Faulkner does deal deliberately with Christian symbols and even with Christian themes, as witnessed particularly by *The Fable*. It seems to be true also that Faulkner has some recognition of the existence of original sin. But it is still a tremendous leap to Stewart's conclusion that Faulkner "can with justice be regarded as one of the most profoundly Christian writers in our time." A good deal of work remains to be done on the nature and extent of Christian meaning in Faulkner, but meanwhile a safer guide would be Hyatt Waggoner, also a man with religious presuppositions and perceptions. ("William Faulkner's Passion Week of the Heart" in *The Tragic Vision and the Christian Faith*, edited by Nathan A. Scott, Jr.) Even after the appearance of *The Fable* he said of Faulkner:

> There *is* a difference in tone and mood between Faulkner's early and later works, and one way of pointing to that difference is to say that in the books of approximately the last fifteen years one often feels the effort to affirm some kind of faith, though the precise nature of this faith very often remains unclear. It is also true to say that Faulkner the man, when he speaks as prophet and moralist, as he did most notably from the platform afforded him by his reception of the Nobel Prize, has in recent years consistently urged us to have faith in man and his destiny; though, again, precisely what this means, precisely what obligations and commitments it involves, is far from clear, when we inspect the pronouncements themselves . . . . But, though Faulkner's mood has changed over the years, and though the relative proportions in his work of denial and affirmation have shifted, Christians who would claim him for one of their own had best proceed cautiously.

However cautious we should be in sharing Stewart's enthusiasm over recent developments in American literature, we can still share many of [illegible] insights into our earlier literatu[illegible] For one thing, he demonstrates the p[illegible] vasive influence of Puritanism in [illegible] life and letters, and its remarka[illegible] staying power. Not only has th[illegible] been a great revival of interest in Pu[illegible] tan life and thought, but the effect [illegible] Puritanism on Hawthorne and ev[illegible] on Melville is being worked out to[illegible] greater extent, and there is also [illegible] growing realization that Henry Jam[illegible] and T. S. Eliot owe a great deal m[illegible] to Puritan tradition than has been g[illegible] erally recognized. Another thi[illegible] which he points out merely in passi[illegible] but which deserves greater emphas[illegible] is the significance of recent shifts [illegible] critical opinion with consequent r[illegible] in literary prestige of those writers w[illegible] came closest to an awareness of the s[illegible] fulness of man. At the close of t[illegible] 19th century the giants were cons[illegible] ered to be Emerson, Whitman, Twa[illegible] Longfellow, and Lowell. With the [illegible] ception of Twain, all of these ha[illegible] suffered serious set-backs in presti[illegible] in spite of the substantial poetic co[illegible] tribution of Emerson and the tr[illegible] genius of Whitman as a technical [illegible] novator. Longfellow, Lowell, *et a*[illegible] are now somewhere out on the perip[illegible] ery of American literature, and m[illegible] soon even be exhumed from their [illegible] cent repose in the survey anthologi[illegible] Meanwhile, Hawthorne has continu[illegible] to rise in critical esteem, Herman M[illegible] ville's star has climbed to fantas[illegible] heights, Emily Dickinson can no lon[illegible] er be denied admission into the circ[illegible] of the select eight or ten, and Hen[illegible] James casts a lengthening shadow ov[illegible] the whole 20th century. The reas[illegible] for all this was well put by Allen Ta[illegible] in his *Reactionary Essays*:

> The age that followed, from 18[illegible] on, expired in a genteel secularis[illegible] a mildly didactic order of feeli[illegible] whose ornaments were Lowe[illegible] Longfellow, and Holmes. "Aft[illegible] Emerson had done his work," sa[illegible] Mr. Robert Penn Warren, "any tra[illegible] ic possibilities in New England we[illegible] dissipated." Hawthorne alone [illegible] his time kept pure, in the primiti[illegible] terms, the primitive vision; [illegible] brings the Puritan tragedy to [illegible] climax. Man measured by a gre[illegible] idea outside himself, is found wa[illegible] ing. But for Emerson man . . . b[illegible] ing himself the Over-Soul, is i[illegible] nately perfect; there is no strugg[illegible] . . . because there is no possibili[illegible] of error. There is no drama in h[illegible] man character, because there is [illegible] tragic fault. It is not surprisin[illegible]

then, that after Emerson, New England literature tastes like a drink of cambric tea. Its very center of vision had disappeared.

Still another worthwhile insight which Stewart gives us is that there are remarkably few naturalists who are consistent with their own theory. He points out the inconsistency of Stephen Crane in giving his hero moral stature at the end of *The Red Badge of Courage*, and of Frank Norris (who turned mystic in his most ambitious work, *The Octopus*). Sinclair Lewis, still occasionally called a naturalist, was patently an idealist, or his savage indignation would have had nothing to feed on. Stewart might also have added to the ex-naturalists Dos Passos, who has done a complete political turnabout since the 'thirties, and John Steinbeck, who often lapses into mysticism, or sentimentalism, or both. Stewart advances Dreiser and Farrell as the only candidates left for the "best naturalist" lag. Even applied to Dreiser the term must be qualified. He flirted with both Communism (he believed in and worked for social amelioration all his life) and Catholicism in his later years, and there was always in his life and works a brooding, moving compassion for the weak and helpless which is out of place in a supposed scientific determinist. Stewart concludes that "the naturalistic philosophy has proved uncongenial, in the main, to the American temperament." We would have liked this still better had he substituted "human" for "American."

One of the remarkable things about this book is the clarity and simplicity of the style. It seems intended for and certainly should be read by the layman as well as the student of American literature. Stewart is careful to define those frequently used but elusive terms, rationalism, romanticism, transcendentalism, and naturalism. The major works he deals with, such as *The Scarlet Letter, Moby Dick, The Red Badge of Courage*, and *American Tragedy* are those with which many readers are familiar. If not, this need be no deterrent, for he summarizes extensively.

There are lessons here for thinking Christians. It *is* possible to write a scholarly work with a distinctively Christian bias, get it published by a University Press, and have it reviewed in influential magazines. *The Saturday Review* gave it a whole page and called it "one of the most stimulating treatments of the American tradition in recent criticism." We have been reminded again that the Christian critic and scholar is right when he insists that a writer's ideas, his commitment, his view of man and his view of God are of paramount importance in any interpretation of literature, and it has been demonstrated to us that the world outside not only needs this lesson, but will listen to it when it comes.

If You Want the Best and "Best Value"

Baldwin
PIANOS • ORGANS

H. M. VAHEY MUSIC CO.
6 Jefferson Ave. SE, Grand Rapids, Mich.

The Sermons of John Donne, selected and introduced by Theodore Gill, 288 pages, paperback, $1.35. New York: Living Age Books, 1958.

Reviewed by George G. Harper, Assistant Professor of English, Calvin College.

It is one of the commonplaces of history that the English Puritans are often charged with delivering, and listening to, sermons of exhausting length and gravity. But as a matter of fact, long sermons were as characteristic of Anglican services in the seventeenth century as they were of Puritan services, and many Anglican divines could match the Puritans when it came to gravity, just as many Puritans could (and did) make of their sermons masterful displays of the kind of wit that bursts out even in the savage sermon-like pages of Milton's *Areopagitica*.

Certainly the sermons of John Donne, the metaphysical poet who became Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral in London in the first quarter of the seventeenth century, are by no means lightweight in length, gravity, or wit. And Mr. Theodore Gill, managing editor of the *Christian Century*, has done good service by selecting and introducing a handful of Donne's sermons for this paperback edition, which depends on the new scholarly edition of the sermons now being issued by the University of California Press.

The length of Donne's sermons impresses one first of all. The shortest in Mr. Gill's selection could not have been delivered in less than an hour; the longest many have taken three hours. It says much for the members of the Church of England of Donne's time to state the fact that these homiletic leviathans were listened to by turnaway crowds, many of them standing for the entire service in the cold, drafty old cathedral. And it was not only the youthful-courtier-turned-divine that drew them there (although even in those days the noisy and gurgling repentant sinner was given more attention in some quarters than the sober man who had always applied himself to his religion) — Donne's sermons preached today would no doubt still fill a drafty cathedral with regularity. Nor was it the wit alone which drew them, for Donne's wit was, in the sermons, not the mordant wit of his *Satires* and other poems, but the brilliant wit of the scholastic lawyer who had read through Luther, Calvin, Ignatius of Loyola, and Bellarmine as a youth who needed to prepare himself thoroughly to choose among the communions. This sermonic wit is a dry wit, coupling disparate facts and images together, in the interest now not of an ironic laugh or a new love-conquest but of an incisive and attention-catching thrust of truth home to the hearts of men troubled, as he himself was, by the crumbling of old religious and moral and intellectual certainties in the face of that "New Philosophy" of Bacon, which "calls all in doubt." No, his hearers came to be touched in their hearts, and nudged in their consciences, and Donne, the seventeenth century's master of the dialectic of the heart, a searcher of his own conscience who could find few peers even among the Puritans (who have, perhaps, held that title exclusively too long), knew how to propound paradoxes and find the dry and yet biting figures which would reach them and make them feel and think anew, and would send them to their prayerbones (an attitude which it was still convenient to assume in public in seventeenth-century London, as in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Geneva).

Mr. Gill's Introduction, which is in some ways journalistic and glib, catches up in itself perhaps too much of Donne's manner to be comfortable reading in this era, and does too little justice to Donne the preacher of Christ crucified (and too much to Donne the existentialist — surely it is anachronistic to find in Donne the kind of *Angst* which it is fashionable to assume today?). The introduction has the merit, nevertheless, of pointing up the secret of Donne's sermons. And that secret is — that Donne spoke to the hearts and consciences of his hearers out of a wealth of rich spiritual and moral experience which had been impinged upon and shaped by a long and acute study of Christian doctrine and certainly some powerful study of the Bible in the original tongues. Doctrine is here, surely, but it is here in the sermons as a kind of hidden structure upon which the body of moral and spiritual *appeal* is affixed. Donne's "naked, thinking heart" is here, but it is a *thinking* heart, and its beats are disciplined beats. Donne throughout uses explication as an aid to the preaching of the text's meaning, not as the main feature of his presentation. And he is sure of his doctrine, and sure of its relevance to his hearers and his times. Being sure, and being learned, and being experienced ("Expert beyond experience," Eliot calls him) he can then preach with conviction, can probe the human sensibility and find out the springs of its sins and miseries (and here his study of Calvin becomes apparent) and can then offer the advice, the *cure*, which in all the sermons is plainly pointed out in Christ.

Witness:

> . . . I can say to you all here, *The grace of our Lord Iesus Christ be with you, and remaine with you all;* I can say to them all there, *The Body of our Lord Iesus Christ which was given for you, preserve you to everlasting life*: I can bring it so neare; but only the worthy bearer, and the worthy receiver, can call this Lord, this Jesus, this Christ, *Immanuel, God with us;* onely that Virgin soule, devirginated in the blood of *Adam*, but restored in the blood of the Lambe, hath this *Ecce*, this testimony, this assurance, that God is with him; they that have this *Ecce*, this testimony, in a rectified conscience, are Godfathers to this child Jesus, and may call him *Immanuel, God with us;* for, as no man can deceive God, so God can deceive no man; God cannot live in the darke himselfe, neither can he leave those, who are his, in the darke: If he be with thee, he will make thee see, that he is with thee; and never goe out of thy sight, till he have brought thee, where thou canst never goe out of his (Sermon on *Isaiah* 7:14),

and on the nature of revelation and the believers' attitude:

> . . . God gives us, not onely that which is meerly necessary, but that which is convenient too: He does not onely feed us, but *feed us with marrow, and with fatnesse*; he gives us our instruction in cheerful forms, not in a sowre, and sullen, and angry, and unacceptable way, but cheerfully, in *Psalms*, which is also a limited, and a restrained form; Not in an *Oration*, not in *Prose*, but in *Psalms;* which is such a form as is both curious, and requires diligence in the making, and then when it is made, can have nothing, no syllable taken from it, nor added to it: Therefore is God's will delivered to us in *Psalms*, that we might have it the more cheerfully, and that we might have it the more certainly, because where all the words are numbered, and measured, and weighed, the whole work is the lesse subject to falsification, either by subtraction or addition. God speaks to us *in oratione structa*, in a limited, in a diligent form; Let us (not) speak to him in *oratione soluta;* not *pray*, not *preach*, not *hear*, slackly, suddenly, unadvisedly, extemporally, occasionally, indiligently; but let all our speech to him, be weighed, and measured in the weights of the *Sanctuary*, let us be content to preach, and to hear within the compass of our Articles and content to pray in those *formes* which the Church hath meditated for us, and recommended to us (Sermon on *Psalm* 38:2),

and on the Christian's duty to keep himself in *being*:

> There cannot be a greater unthankfulnesse to God, then to desire to be *Nothing* at all, rather then to be that, that God would have thee to be; To desire to be out of the world, rather then to glorifie him, by thy patience in it (from the same Sermon),

and last, to show the style at its most typical, its most *efficient* in the use of figures to advance imponderables, and at its most concise:

> We begin with that which is elder then our beginning, and shall overlive our end, The mercy of God. *will sing of thy mercy and judg ment,* sayes *David;* when we fi ourselves upon the meditation an modulation of the mercy of Goc even his judgements cannot put u out of tune, but we shall sing, an be chearefull, even in them. A God made grasse for beasts, befor he made beasts, and beasts for mar before he made man: As in tha first generation, the Creation, s in the regeneration, our re-creating he begins with that which wa necessary for that which followes Mercy before Judgement. Nay t say that mercy was first, is bu to post-date mercy; to preferr mercy but so, is to diminish mercy the names of first or last derogat from it, for first and last are bu ragges of time, and his mercy hat no relation to time, no limitation i time, it is not first, nor last, bu eternall. everlasting; Let the Devil make me so far desperate as to con ceive a time when there was n mercy, and he hath made me so fa an Atheist, as to conceive a tim when there was no God; If I despoil him of his mercy, any one minute and say, now God hath no mercy, fo that minute I discontinue his ver Godhead, and his beeing. . . . So then here we consider not mercy as it i radically in God, and an essentia attribute of his, but productively i us, as it is an action, a workin upon us, and that more especially as God takes all occasions to exercis that action, and to shed that merc upon us: for particular mercies ar feathers of his wings, and that prayer *Lord let thy mercy lighten upon us as our trust is in thee*, is our bird lime; particular mercies are tha cloud of Quailes which hovered ove the host of Israel, and that prayer *Lord let thy mercy lighten upon us* is our net to catch, our Gomer t fill of those Quailes . . . . here i the Congregation we cannot suck in word from the preacher, we canno speak, we cannot sigh a prayer t God, but that that whole breath an aire is made of mercy (Sermon o *Isaiah* 7:14).

Mr. Gill's work has been done wel despite some editorial errors here an there (surely the word for Donne' imagination is not *mordant* [p. 115 but rather *morbid*?). The preface to the individual sermons are ver helpful, and the bibliography, despit its rather unprofessional and gossip nature, is welcome to the reader wh will want to know Donne better, as w all should.